



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/791,279

03/03/2004

Theodor Stern

26041

8931

20529 7590 07/01/2009  
THE NATH LAW GROUP  
112 South West Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

VAKILI, ZOHREH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1614

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/01/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/791,279	<b>Applicant(s)</b> STERN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> ZOHREH VAKILI	<b>Art Unit</b> 1614	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) ZOHREH VAKILI. (3) Susanne Hopkins.

(2) Ardin Marschel. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 09 June 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: WO 0059556.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's discussed the merits of the rejection over the reference to WO 0059556 with the Examiners. Examiners provided clarification as to the grounds of the rejection and agreed to reconsider the rejections of record in view of Applicant's amendments and/or remarks. Applicant has over come the rejection under 102 in reference to WO 0059556. Applicant discussed and provided clarification directed to glycolide vs. lactide.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Zohreh Vakili/ Patent Examiner Art Unit 1614	
--	--